

**REMARKS**

By the present amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 10, 11, 13, 19, and 21 and canceled claim 9 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. In the Office Action mailed December 11, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter; rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0044812, to Byrd et al. ("Byrd"); and rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication Application No. 2002/0152245, to McCaskey et al. ("McCaskey"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

**I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claim 9 has been canceled, and therefore the rejection of this claim is rendered moot. With respect to pending claims 8 and 10, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection. The Examiner states, "it appears the limitations of said claim are merely claiming statements defining various items, therefore said limitations do not appear to be defining any functional interrelations which permits the computer program's functionality (or data structure's functionality) to be realized." Office Action at 2. However, independent claim 8 recites, "A system for generating a user interface for a web application program," the system comprising, *inter alia*, "a first set of database tables . . . ; a first set of transactions . . . ; [and] means for generating the web pages by accessing the first set of database tables using the first set of transactions." At least these recitations include functional interrelations between the claimed elements. Therefore, independent claim 8 and dependent claim 10 are directed toward statutory

subject matter, and the rejection of claims 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is improper and should be withdrawn.

**II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Byrd**

On pages 2-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Byrd. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), each and every element as set forth in the claims must be described, either expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131. Byrd fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1-8.

For example, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "means for enabling a user to create a web page layout by: selecting graphical user interface (GUI) components from the repository . . ." Byrd fails to disclose at least this element. The Examiner contends that the Abstract and Fig. 1 of Byrd disclose this element. However, Fig. 1 merely depicts a general computing system, and the Abstract merely describes a set of commands used to retrieve web page information in a specific order. Neither these portions of Byrd, nor any other portion of Byrd, disclose or teach "means for enabling a user to create a web page layout by: selecting graphical user interface (GUI) components from the repository . . ." as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Byrd fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Byrd should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 depend from base claim 1 and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, for the same reasons discussed above in connection with claim

1, dependent claims 2-7 are also not anticipated by Byrd. Therefore, the rejections of claims 2-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Byrd should be withdrawn as well.

Independent claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, “a first set of database tables to define screens including tables that describe graphical user interface (GUI) screen components, screen layout, component configuration, application model assignment, and event handling . . . .” The Examiner contends that paragraph 10 of Byrd discloses this feature. However, paragraph 10 of Byrd merely describes a control process for retrieving and parsing commands stored in a web page to build a table reflective of the sequence in which to process the commands. As such, the table disclosed in Byrd merely stores information reflecting a sequence in which to process commands. Byrd does not disclose or teach a set of database tables that describe “graphical user interface (GUI) screen components, screen layout, component configuration, application model assignment, and event handling,” as recited in claim 8. Therefore, Byrd fails to disclose each and every element of claim 8, and the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Byrd should be withdrawn.

### **III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of McCaskey**

On pages 5-10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McCaskey. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

McCaskey appears to disclose “templates” used to construct web pages, wherein different news “stories” and/or “images” may be included in the web pages. McCaskey further describes enabling “a proofreader 150 to edit stories in a database 500, link

stories in a database 400 with images in image library 142, and start publish program 133.” See McCaskey, paragraph 0051.

Independent claim 1, however, recites a combination of elements, including at least the following:

“means for enabling a user to create a web page layout by:  
selecting (GUI) components from the repository,  
arranging the selected GUI components within the web  
page,  
defining interaction between at least two of the selected GUI  
components, the interaction including causing a first GUI component to  
perform an action in response to an event generated by a second GUI  
component, and  
defining interaction between one or more of the GUI  
components and the web application program, the interaction involving  
business data and one or more backend systems . . .”

McCasky fails to disclose at least these elements. For example, the editing of stories and linking of images described by McCasky does not anticipate or suggest the claimed “defining interaction between at least two of the selected GUI components, the interaction including causing a first GUI component to perform an action in response to an event generated by a second GUI component.” Furthermore, McCasky fails to disclose “defining interaction between one or more of the GUI components and the web application program, the interaction involving business data and one or more backend systems.” Instead, McCasky only discloses selecting stories and linking images for a web page template.

Therefore, McCasky fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1 and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of McCasky should be withdrawn. Independent claims 11 and 19, although of different scope from claim 1, are distinguishable from the prior art for at least the same reasons discussed above in

connection with claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claims 11 and 19 in view of McCaskey should be withdrawn as well.

Claims 2-7, 12-18, and 20-23 depend from base claim 1, 11, or 19, and, therefore, are allowable for the same reasons discussed above. Dependent claims 2-7, 12-18, and 20-23 are thus not anticipated by McCaskey and the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn as well.

Independent claim 8 recites a combination of elements, including at least the following:

a first set of database tables to define screens including tables that describe graphical user interface (GUI) screen components, screen layout, component configuration, application model assignment, and event handling;

a first set of transactions for administrating the first set of database tables;

means for generating the web pages by accessing the first set of database tables using the first set of transactions, wherein accessing the first set of database tables includes accessing information relating to at least one of the GUI screen components and event handling; and

a second set of database tables based upon the first set of database tables, the second set of database tables being used for customization and personalization of the user interface.

McCaskey fails to disclose these elements of claim 8. McCaskey appears to describe an editorial database 400 that stores information in story files. See, e.g., McCaskey, paragraph 51. However, McCaskey does not disclose or teach "a first set of database tables to define screens including tables that describe graphical user interface (GUI) screen components, screen layout, component configuration, application model assignment, and event handling," and "a second set of database tables based upon the first set of database tables, the second set of database tables being used for customization and personalization of the user interface." In addition, McCaskey fails to

disclose or teach that "accessing the first set of database tables includes accessing information relating to at least one of the GUI screen components and event handling," as recited in claim 8. In contrast, the database and tables described in McCaskey merely store stories and related organizational information. See, e.g., McCaskey, paragraph 67. As such, McCaskey does not disclose database tables that describe "graphical user interface (GUI) screen components, screen layout, component configuration, application model assignment, and event handling," as set forth in claim 8.

Accordingly, McCaskey fails to disclose each and every element of claim 8, and the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of McCaskey should be withdrawn. Claim 10 depends from claim 8 and, therefore, includes all of the limitations of claim 8. Accordingly, for the same reasons discussed above in connection with claim 8, claim 10 is also not anticipated by McCaskey. Therefore, the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of McCaskey is improper and should be withdrawn as well.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants, therefore, request the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of pending claims 1-8 and 10-23.

The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicants do not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise,

Applicants decline to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the final Office Action.

If a telephone interview will expedite issuance of this application, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' representative, whose name and registration number appear below, to discuss any remaining issues.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 16, 2007

By: Bradley Edelman  
Bradley Edelman  
Reg. No. 57,648